DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 269 807 CS 209 810

AUTHOR Click, J. William; Kopenhaver, Lillian Lodge
TITLE Principals' and Newspaper Advisers' Attitudes toward Freedom of the Student Press in the United States.
PUB DATE 4 Aug 86
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (69th, Norman, OK, August 3-6, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Responsibility; Administrator Role; Censorship; Discipline; *Faculty Advisers; *Freedom of Speech; High Schools; Journalism Education; *Principals; *School Newspapers; Social Problems; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Journalism Research

ABSTRACT

The opinions of principals and newspaper advisers toward high school student press freedom were surveyed in a random sample of principals and newspaper advisers at 502 high schools in all 50 states. Subjects completed a 39-statement instrument on which they indicated levels of agreement or disagreement on the following concerns: control and disruption, role of student newspapers, censorship, responsibilities of advisers, role of administrators, controversial issues, and freedom of expression in general. Usable responses were received from 191 school newspaper advisers and 144 high school principals. Among the findings were the following: (1) 58.8% of the principals, but only 22.5% of the advisers, agreed that school administrators should have the right to prohibit publication of articles they think harmful, even though such articles might not be libelous, obscene, or disruptive; (2) 58.5% of the principals agreed that maintaining discipline in the school is more important than publishing a newspaper free from administrative censorship, while 74% of the advisers disagreed; (3) 96.5% of the principals and 89% of the advisers agreed that student newspaper advisers should review all copy before it is printed; and (4) 46.5% of the principals disagreed that the student newspaper should be allowed to print a story it can prove is true even if printing the story will hurt the school's reputation, while 44.5% of the advisers agreed that such an article should be published. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED269807

PRINCIPALS' AND NEWSPAPER ADVISERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD FREEDOM OF THE STUDENT PRESS IN THE UNITED STATES

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J.W. Click and Lillian Lodge Kopenhaver

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

By

J. William Click
Louisiana State University

and

Lillian Lodge Kopenhaver
Florida International University

Presented to the Annual Convention of the
Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication
Secondary Education Division
University of Oklahoma, Norman
August 4, 1986

CS 209810

ABSTRACT

Principals' and Newspaper Advisers' Attitudes Toward Freedom of the Student Press in the United States

By J. William Click, Louisiana State University, and
Lillian Lodge Kopenhaver, Florida International University

Principals and newspaper advisers at 502 high schools in all 50 states were surveyed using a 39-statement instrument on which they responded with one of seven levels of agreement or disagreement. The sample was drawn from all high schools in the nation, not just those known to have a school newspaper.

Four mailings from October 1984-September 1985 found that five schools had been closed and yielded responses from 222 schools (44.6%). Of these, 58 had no school paper. Only responses from principals at schools with newspapers (144 or 32.8%) and active newspaper advisers (191 or 43.5%) were included in the results.

More than half of the principals (58.8%) but only one-fifth of the advisers (22.5%) strongly agreed or agreed that school administrators should have the right to prohibit publication of articles they think harmful, even though such articles might not be libelous, obscene or disruptive; 44.0% of the advisers strongly disagreed or disagreed. Also 58.5% of the principals strongly agreed or agreed that maintaining discipline in the school is more important than publishing a newspaper free from administrative censorship; 29.6% of the advisers strongly agreed or agreed while 29.5% of the advisers strongly disagreed or disagreed. Nearly half of the principals (45.3%) agreed or strongly agreed that it is more important for the school to function smoothly than for the student newspaper to be free from administrative censorship while half of the advisers (50.0%) strongly disagreed or disagreed. Nearly half of the principals (46.5%) strongly disagreed or disagreed that the student newspaper should be allowed to print a story it can prove is true even if printing the story will hurt the school's reputation while 44.5% of the advisers strongly agreed or agreed with such publication.

The overwhelming majority of principals (96.5%) and advisers (89.0%) strongly agreed or agreed that student newspaper advisers should review all copy before it is printed. Likewise, more than two thirds of the principals (79.6%) and advisers (68.8%) say the adviser should correct misspellings and a similar number (65.5% of the principals and 70.7% of the advisers) say the adviser should correct factual inaccuracies in student copy before publication even if it is not possible to confer with the students involved.

More than two-thirds of the principals (71.4%) and three-fifths of the advisers (59.2%) agreed or strongly agreed that student rights to publish a newspaper must be balanced against the realization that students are not fully trained journalists. More than half the principals (60.2%) and one-third of the advisers (34.2%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the assertion that once students have been trained in press responsibility, they should have full control over all editorial content of the student newspaper. At the same time, 51.4% of the principals and 73.2% of the advisers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that high school students are too young to practice responsibly freedom of the press. Both principals (83.4%) and advisers (67.5%) disagreed with the statement that school administrators at their own schools have little understanding of the First Amendment rights of the student newspaper.

Advisers were more supportive of press freedom than principals. Respondents at schools under 500 enrollment indicated more likelihood of repression as did those at schools publishing six or fewer newspaper issues a year. There were no significant differences in responses from public schools and private schools or from more-experienced advisers and less-experienced advisers.

Rights to freedom of expression in the high school student press have been established by the courts over the last two decades. High school principals and newspaper advisers, however, still do not view the student newspaper as a place where students can express themselves with full freedom.

Opinions toward freedom of the high school press have been studied in Florida[1] and through testimony from selected students and advisers[2] but most studies have been limited to samples within a single state, award-winning advisers or publications, or persons involved in controversies over freedom of the high school press.

Method

In an attempt to secure a nationwide reading on opinions toward high school student press freedom, we drew a systematic sample of 502 schools in all 50 states from Patterson's American Education, without regard to whether the school had an award-winning newspaper or even a newspaper at all.

We expected that asking people who did not know us questions about press freedom would result in a low response rate. However, the importance of surveying a national sample outweighed the possibility of the lower return.

The survey instrument was developed from one used by Kopenhaver and Martinson in Florida[3] and consisted largely of 39 statements to which respondents indicated a level of agreement/disagreement on a seven point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

The same instrument was sent to the principal and the newspaper adviser at all 502 schools in the sample. Four mailings were made over a 12-month period, October 1984-September 1985. Five schools had been closed, leaving 497 in the sample. Responses were received from 222 different schools (44.6%). Of these, 58 replied that they had no school newspaper. In addition, several respondents said they had at one time advised newspapers or taught in schools with newspapers; their responses were discarded so that only principals and active advisers in schools with newspapers were included in the results.

Results

Usable responses were received from 191 school newspaper advisers (43.5%) and 144 high school principals (32.8%).

The 39 statements dealt with seven areas of concern: control and disruption, role of student newspaper, censorship, responsibilities of advisers, role of administrators, controversial issues, and opinions toward freedom of expression in general.

Control and Disruption: Principals and advisers disagreed on most of the statements that relate to control and disruption. More than half of the principals (58.8%) but only about one-fifth the advisers (22.5%) strongly agreed or agreed that school administrators should have the right to prohibit publication of articles they think harmful, even though such articles might not be legally libelous, obscene or disruptive; however, 44.0% of the advisers disagreed or strongly disagreed. A majority of the principals (58.5%) strongly agreed or agreed that maintaining discipline in the school is more important than publishing a newspaper free from administrative censorship; 29.6% of the advisers also strongly agreed or agreed, while only 29.5% disagreed or strongly disagreed (See Table I).

A slightly different reaction was obtained to a highly similar statement. Nearly half of the principals (45.3%) but only 14.7% of the advisers strongly agreed or agreed with the statement that it is more important for the school to function smoothly than for the student newspaper to be free from administrative censorship. One-half the advisers (50.0%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with that statement.

Related to disruption, 47.6% of the principals agreed or slightly agreed with the statement that newspaper advisers frequently fail to see how the paper can disrupt other aspects of the school, while 51.0% of the advisers strongly disagreed or disagreed. Principals (34.1%) believe that school administrators should have some voice in the selection of the student newspaper editor, while only 13.1% of the advisers strongly agreed or agreed with this idea; in contrast, 59.7% of the advisers strongly disagreed or disagreed.

In the general area of control and disruption, principals and advisers agreed, but to different extents, that the administration has the right to regulate the time and place of distribution of the student newspaper (84.7% of the principals and 42.9% of the advisers strongly agreed or agreed).

Principals and advisers differ in their views of whether embarrassing truths should be published. Nearly half of the principals (46.5%) strongly disagreed or disagreed that the student newspaper should be allowed to print a story that it can prove is true, even if printing the story will hurt the school's reputation, while 25.4% of the advisers similarly disagreed or strongly disagreed; 44.5% of advisers strongly agreed or agreed with such publication. Both principals and advisers agreed, but to varying degrees, that articles critical of the school board, local politicians and teachers could be published. The number who say such articles never should be published will alarm some observers: 20.3% of the principals and 10.1% of the advisers say articles critical of the school board never should appear in the student newspaper; 21.0% of the principals and 14.3% of the advisers say articles critical of local politicians never should appear; and 29.6% of the principals and 22.5% of the advisers say articles critical of teachers or administrators never should be published.

Role of Student Newspaper: Students are seen as less mature and less competent than others to practice journalism responsibly. More than two-thirds of the principals (71.4%) and three-fifths of the advisers (59.2%) agreed or strongly agreed that student rights to publish a newspaper must be balanced against the realization that students are not fully

trained journalists. Three-fifths of the principals (60.2%) and one-third of the advisers (34.2%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the assertion that once students have been trained in press responsibility, they should have full control over all editorial content of the student newspaper, even though the courts have ruled that they should. Only 7.0% of the principals and 16.8% of the advisers agreed or strongly agreed with that assertion.

At the same time, however, 51.4% of the principals and 73.2% of the advisers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that high school students are too young to practice responsibly freedom of the press.

While we did not try to define the function of a student newspaper, responses were elicited to the newspaper as a learning tool, as a means of expression and as a public relations tool. A majority of principals (59.0%) and a plurality of advisers (40.0%) agreed or strongly agreed that the student newspaper is more a learning tool than a vehicle for the expression of student opinion. Four-fifths of both the principals (84.4%) and advisers (82.7%) agreed or strongly agreed that the student newspaper is a valuable public relations tool for the school. More than one-third of the principals (36.4%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that guarantees of freedom of expression in the student newspaper outweigh public relations considerations; in contrast, an equal number of advisers (36.7%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.

Censorship: It has been more than 50 years since the Supreme Court in Near v. Minnesota (1931) affirmed that it was the chief purpose of the First Amendment to prevent "all previous restraints upon publications." The Supreme Court has not ruled on prior review of student publications,

but lower courts have consistently declared such systems unconstitutional.[4]

However, responses in this study suggest that prior review is commonly accepted and that both principals and advisers believe that student expression should be monitored. In fact, 95.8% of the principals and 76.0% of the advisers agreed or strongly agreed that if an administrator asks the adviser to read copy prior to publication, the adviser should do so. The overwhelming majority, 96.5% of the principals and 89.0% of the advisers, agreed or strongly agreed that the student newspaper advisers should review all copy before it is printed. It is difficult to conclude whether this review constitutes censorship, but it is likely to lean in that direction. Both principals (56.0%) and advisers (70.5%) agreed that having school administrators read student newspaper copy before publication is a form of censorship.

Responsibilities of Advisers: The adviser's responsibilities are less clear. Principals (79.6%) and advisers (68.8%) say that the adviser should correct misspellings that students make in their copy. Similarly, principals (65.5%) and advisers (70.7%) say that the adviser should correct factual inaccuracies in student copy before publication even if it is not possible to confer with the students involved. Opinions of both groups vary on whether or not an adviser who knows that the newspaper is going to publish something that will put the school in a bad light has a professional obligation to see that the item is not published: 36.4% of the principals but only 18.1% of the advisers agreed or strongly agreed; only 20.7% of the principals disagreed or strongly disagreed, but 42.0% of the advisers disagreed or strongly disagreed.

The majority of both principals (67.6%) and advisers (56.8%) believe that newspaper advisers who do not read student newspaper copy before

publication should be held personally responsible for any complaints about the newspaper. The majority of both also agreed or strongly agreed (advisers 59.6% and principals 68.8%) that the student newspaper adviser is ultimately responsible for the content of the student newspaper rather than the student editors, and that the adviser who reviews copy for the student newspaper prior to publication becomes liable for the content.

Role of Administrators: More than half of the principals (54.2%) and advisers (55.0%) disagreed that only persons with degrees in journalism should be advisers to student newspapers. Approximately one-third, however, agreed with that concept (32.6% principals, 29.4% advisers). Nearly half of the advisers (47.7%) agreed that administrators believe it is more important to have newspaper advisers who will not rock the boat than ones with journalistic and advising skills. More than half the principals (61.4%) disagreed, while 14.3% of the principals and 18.3% of the advisers were neutral on that statement.

Both principals (83.7%) and advisers (67.5%) disagreed with the statement that school administrators at their own schools have little understanding of the First Amendment rights of the student newspaper. Only 8.8% of the principals and 21.9% of the advisers agreed with the statement. Principals are split on the statement that administrators seldom worry about the student newspaper unless it gets into controversial areas (49.0% agreed, 47.6% disagreed) while 74.6% of the advisers agreed and only 22.1% disagreed.

It is more important to the school board for the school to have a good image than to have an uncensored student newspaper, according to 59.1% of the principals and 56.7% of the advisers. More than one-half (61.6%) of the principals say that as long as the school board pays part of the

costs, school administrators have control over what is printed in the school newspaper; nearly that many of the advisers (57.4%) disagreed with that statement.

Controversial Issues: There is general agreement that the student newspaper can deal with controversy and with a broad range of issues. The overwhelming majority of both principals and advisers disagreed with the idea that controversial issues have no place in a student newspaper and with the statement that the student newspaper should concern itself only with issues that relate to the school, not those of the larger community, state or nation.

In dealing with controversy, 88.7% of the principals and 60.5% of the advisers say that the adviser is obligated to inform the administration of any controversial stories before the newspaper goes to press, and 83.1% of the principals and 73.2% of the advisers say if the student newspaper takes one side of a controversial issue, it should be required to publish the other side. How it would be required was not stated on the survey: It could be required by the newspaper's editorial policy rather than an outside agent.

Freedom of Expression: Advisers and principals agreed to differing degrees on broad issues of press freedom. Nearly all of the principals (93.6%) and advisers (98.4%) agreed that a free press is fundamental to American society. (See Table II) They are less strong--61.3% of the principals and 66.5% of the advisers--in support of the idea that the American Nazi Party has as much a constitutional right to a parade permit as the American Legion. They also support the statement that society has an obligation to protect the First Amendment rights of groups such as the

American Nazi Party and the Ku Klux Klan (principals 63.4%, advisers 70.0%). They generally agreed that most Americans support the concept of freedom of the press in theory but not in practice (principals 68.5%, advisers 75.3%).

Public and Private Schools: Although the legal guarantees of press freedom are greater for public schools than for private schools, there were no significant differences in the responses to the 39 questions between the respondents at public schools and those at private schools. The small number of private school responses (11%) made it nearly impossible to test for significance, but the replies from the two groups very closely paralleled each other.

School Size: Responses analyzed by school size across the five enrollment categories showed few differences. There were too few schools of more than 2,000 students (7%) to test for significance of that group. Among the other four groups, responses from schools of under 500 students, which composed 40 percent of the returns, were different from the three larger groups (1,001-1,500, 1,501-2,000, and more than 2,000) on three statements.

Respondents at the smallest schools (60.0%) disagreed with the statement that "the student newspaper should be allowed to print a story that it can prove is true even if printing the story will hurt the school's reputation," while respondents at the three groups of larger schools (48.1%, 56.8%, 75.0%) agreed with that statement ($p < .01$).

"It is more important for the school to function smoothly than for the student newspaper to be free from administrative censorship," according to respondents at the smallest schools (51.6%). Those at the three groups of larger schools disagreed with that statement (48.1%, 51.0%, 69.5%, $p < .001$).

These responses may reflect that

people in smaller communities and smaller schools believe that community harmony should prevail over press freedom if the two come into conflict or that administrative censorship is unlikely and therefore not a concern or that people in larger schools are more supportive of free expression and less concerned about smooth functioning of the school community.

"If the adviser knows that a newspaper is going to publish something that will put the school in a bad light, the adviser has a professional obligation to see that that particular item is not published," according to respondents of schools of fewer than 500 students (52.0%). Respondents at the three groups of larger schools disagreed (53.4%, 64.7%, 60.0%, $p < .001$).

Responses were slightly different by enrollment class for three other statements. Respondents in all enrollment categories except 1,501-2,000 agreed that maintaining discipline in the school is more important than publishing a newspaper free from administrative censorship ($p < .001$).

Respondents at schools under 1,000 enrollment agreed with the statement that school administrators should have the right to prohibit publication of articles they think harmful even though such articles might not be legally libelous, obscene or disruptive. Respondents at the larger schools disagreed ($p < .001$).

Respondents at schools under 500 students (50.4%) agreed that as long as the school board or school pays part of the costs, school administrators have control over what is printed in the school newspaper. Respondents at schools of 501-1,000 students were evenly divided on the statement (45.5% agreed, 46.8% disagreed), while those at schools of 1,001-1,500 students slightly disagreed (50.9%) and those at schools of 1,501-2,000 (72.3%)

disagreed ($p < .01$).

Frequency of Publication: Analysis by frequency of publication yielded significant differences on 13 of the 39 intensity questions. We compared the 49 percent of the schools that published six or fewer issues a year to the 51 percent that published seven or more issues. They disagreed on only four statements with the differences on the other nine being in degree of agreement or disagreement.

Respondents at schools publishing seven or more issues a year agreed that the paper should be allowed to print a true story that will hurt the school's reputation while those at schools publishing six or fewer issues a year disagreed ($p < .001$).

School administrators should have the right to prohibit publication of articles they think harmful, according to respondents at schools publishing six or fewer issues a year. Those publishing seven or more issues disagreed ($p < .001$).

If the adviser knows that the paper plans to publish something that will put the school in a bad light, the adviser has a professional obligation to see that that item is not published, according to respondents at schools that publish six or fewer issues a year, who slightly agreed. Those publishing seven or more issues disagreed ($p < .01$).

Those publishing six or fewer issues agreed that as long as the school board or school pays part of the costs, school administrators have control over what is printed in the school newspaper. Those publishing seven or more issues disagreed ($p < .01$).

Those publishing more issues much more strongly disagreed with the idea that school administrators should have some voice in the selection of the student newspaper editor than those publishing fewer issues ($p < .001$). Those publishing more issues also more strongly disagreed with the statement that it is more important for the school to function smoothly than for the student newspaper to be free from administrative censorship than those publishing fewer issues ($p < .001$).

Respondents publishing seven or more issues disagreed much more with the statement that articles critical of teachers or administrators never should appear in the student newspaper than those publishing six or fewer issues a year ($p < .05$).

Those publishing fewer issues more strongly agreed with the idea that advisers have an obligation to inform the administration of any controversial stories before the newspaper goes to press than those publishing more issues ($p < .05$).

Those publishing more issues more strongly agreed that having school administrators read student newspaper copy before publication is a form of censorship than those publishing fewer issues ($p < .05$).

Respondents publishing seven or more issues slightly agreed that maintaining discipline is more important than publishing a newspaper free from administrative censorship, while those publishing fewer issues more strongly agreed ($p < .05$). Those publishing fewer issues more strongly disagreed with the statement that only persons with journalism degrees should be advisers to student newspapers than those publishing more issues ($p < .05$).

Both groups disagree with the assertion that articles critical of the school board never should appear in the student newspaper and that articles critical of teachers or administrators never should appear in the student newspaper, but those publishing seven or more issues a year disagree more strongly ($p < .05$ and $p < .01$).

Experience in Position: Comparison of responses of those in their position one to four years with those in their position five or more years found no significant differences, except that the more experienced advisers more strongly agreed with the idea that the student newspaper is more a learning tool than a vehicle for the expression of student opinion ($p < .01$).

Demographics: Of the usable responses, 88.9 percent (286) represented public schools and 11.1 percent (35) private schools. Two-fifths of the schools (40.0%) have an enrollment of fewer than 500 students, 25 percent range from 501 to 1,000, 17 percent from 1,001 to 1,500, 11 percent from 1,501 to 2,000 and 7 percent more than 2,000.

Length of service of advisers ranged from 0 to 37 years; 50 percent had worked with student newspapers four or fewer years. Principals had held their positions 0 to 22 years with 47 percent having been in the position six or fewer years.

Schools surveyed published as many as 37 issues of the school newspaper in the previous year and planned the same number during the year of the study, with a median of 7 issues per year and a mean of 8.3 issues.

Organizational tools: More than one-half of the newspapers have stylebooks (51.9%) nearly one-half have written editorial policy statements (48.2%) and written job descriptions for the newspapers' editors (44.4%), but only one-fourth have a written staff manual (22.6%) or a written job description for the adviser (24.9%).

There were no differences in the presence of these items between newspapers with less-experienced advisers and those with more-experienced ones, but larger schools were more likely to have stylebooks, staff manuals, written editorial policies and written job descriptions as were those who publish more issues.

Only 29.6% of the schools under 500 enrollment had stylebooks. That percentage increased to 42.9 for 501-1,000, 59.0 for 1,001-1,500, 74.1 for 1,501-2,000 and 83.3 for more than 2,000 ($p < .001$). Nearly one-third publishing six or fewer issues (31.6%) had stylebooks while three-fifths of those publishing seven or more issues (61.1%) did ($p < .001$).

Larger schools were nearly twice as likely to have written editorial policy statements as the smallest schools (28.6% under 500, 47.6% 501-1,000, 59.5% 1,001-1,500, 41.4% 1,501-2,000, 61.1% 2,000+, $p < .001$), and so were those publishing more frequently (30.8% six or fewer issues, 53.1% seven or more issues, $p < .001$).

Written job descriptions for editors were reported by 20.4% of the schools under 500 students, 38.1% of those 501-1,000, 57.5% of the 1,001-1,500 enrollment schools, 58.6% of the 1,501-2,000 ones and 66.7% of those exceeding 2,000 enrollment ($p < .001$). Nearly twice as many schools publishing seven

or more issues a year (50.8%) had such job descriptions as those publishing six or fewer issues (26.3%, $p < .001$).

Written job descriptions for advisers were reported by 18.4% of the smallest schools, 28.6% 501-1,000, 25.0% 1,001-1,500, 20.7% 1,501-2,000 and 50.0% 2,000 or more enrollment ($p < .01$). Likewise, those publishing seven or more issues (32.0%) were more likely to have advisers' job descriptions than those publishing fewer (16.9%, $p < .01$).

Staff manuals were reported by less than one-half of the school newspapers in all five enrollment categories (10.2% under 500, 14.5% 501-1,000, 26.8% 1,001-1,500, 48.3% 1,501-2,000, 38.9% more than 2,000, $p < .001$). Only 8.5% of the schools publishing six or fewer issues a year had staff manuals and 32.0% of those publishing seven or more issues had them ($p < .001$).

Conclusions

One might conclude from the overall findings that schools of more than 500 students and schools publishing seven or more issues of the newspaper each year are more likely to take freedom of the student press more seriously, be better or more formally organized in their newspaper operations with stylebooks, editorial policies, staff manuals and written job descriptions, and possibly be more knowledgeable about the theory and practice of journalism.

Even though almost all of the advisers and principals agreed that a free press is fundamental to American society, with 36.4% of the principals and 66.0% of the advisers strongly agreeing, the reality of both groups'

reactions to student press freedom belies this contention, as the results indicate. Nearly three-quarters of the principals (72.6%) believe that maintenance of discipline is more important than an uncensored press, with two-fifths of the advisers (42.5%) agreeing. In fact, one-fourth of the principals (25.9%) do not believe that it is censorship for administrators to read copy before publication.

Even though the courts have regularly ruled that editors have the ultimate responsibility for the content of the student publication, nearly three-quarters of the principals (73.5%) and more than one-half of the advisers (53.7%) disagreed that students, even if they are trained in press responsibility, should have full control over the editorial content. The message appears to be that press freedom should and does exist for students, but not completely.

Advisers and principals do not have the right, by law, to censor, yet they indicate they are placing themselves in positions of liability by injecting themselves into a prior review process. More than two-thirds of the principals (68.6%) and one third of the advisers (34.0%) agree that administrators should prohibit publication of "harmful" articles, even if they are not legally libelous, obscene or disruptive, the only areas not protected by law. The role of each in the publication process has been clearly defined. Administrators have the responsibility to permit and ensure the free exchange of information and opinion through student publications. Advisers and teachers are facilitators, not censors, who uphold the First Amendment rights of students to print without prior restraint and who provide the training the students need to present complete and accurate reporting. However, almost all respondents (99.3% of the principals and 95.8% of the advisers) agree that advisers should review all copy before publication.

One would assume that since principals are concerned about the image of their schools, their views would tend to be more restrictive of press freedom. One would also assume that since advisers should understand the principles and ethics of press freedom, their views would tend to differ significantly from those of the principals in defending and ensuring press freedom. However, the degree of disagreement between the two is not very strong in many instances.

Perhaps it is due to a lack of knowledge on the part of advisers about the law of the student press, or to a fear of resisting administrative pressures or requests, or to a lack of understanding about the role of the adviser. Whatever the reason, the situation does not encourage and foster a free student press in American high schools and a generation of editors and staff members who fully understand and exercise the constitutional guarantees of freedom of the press.

Footnotes

1. Lillian Lodge Kopenhaver and David Martinson, "South Florida Advisers', Administrators' Attitudes Are Recorded in Controversial Issues Surveys," Columbia Scholastic Press Advisers Association Bulletin, 40:2 (Fall 1982), pp. 9-15.

2. Captive Voices: High School Journalism in America. New York: Schocken Books, 1974.

3. Kopenhaver and Martinson

4. Antonelli v. Hammond, 308 F. Supp. 1329 (D. Mass. 1970); Near v. Minnesota, 283 U.S. 697 (1931); Trujillo v. Love, 322 F. Supp. 592 (D.N.H. 1973); Jacobs v. Board of School Commissioners, (7th Cir. 1973).

TABLE I

Principals' and Advisers' Responses to Attitude Statements about the Student Press in Percent

Statement	Pos.	St.A.	Agr.	Sl.A.	Neu.	Sl.D.	Dis.	St.D.	Mean
Control and Disruption									
1. School administrators should have the right to prohibit publication of articles they think harmful even though such articles might not be legally libelous, obscene or disruptive.	Prn.	20.3	38.5	9.8	8.4	6.3	13.3	3.5	5.042***
	Adv.	8.9	13.6	11.5	11.0	11.0	19.9	24.1	3.424
2. Maintaining discipline in the school is more important than publishing a newspaper free from administrative censorship.	Prn.	28.2	30.3	14.1	6.3	8.5	10.6	2.1	5.232***
	Adv.	6.5	23.1	12.9	15.1	12.9	16.1	13.4	3.930
3. It is more important for the school to function smoothly than for the student newspaper to be free from administrative censorship.	Prn.	19.1	26.2	12.1	7.8	11.3	19.1	4.3	4.595***
	Adv.	2.6	12.1	9.5	14.2	11.6	30.5	19.5	3.105
4. Newspaper advisers frequently fail to see how the paper can disrupt other aspects of the school.	Prn.	7.0	25.9	21.7	10.5	16.1	14.0	4.9	4.356***
	Adv.	2.1	6.3	13.7	15.3	11.6	36.3	14.7	3.042
5. School administrators should have some voice in the selection of the student newspaper editor.	Prn.	15.3	18.8	20.1	18.8	3.5	15.3	8.3	4.444***
	Adv.	4.2	8.9	7.3	8.4	11.5	21.5	38.2	2.685
6. The administration has the right to regulate the time and place of distribution of the student newspaper.	Prn.	42.7	42.0	7.7	4.9	0.7	1.4	0.7	6.139***
	Adv.	12.7	30.2	14.8	14.3	7.4	14.3	6.3	4.582
7. The student newspaper should be allowed to print a story that it can prove is true even if printing the story will hurt the school's reputation.	Prn.	5.6	21.5	9.7	9.7	6.9	23.6	22.9	3.465***
	Adv.	17.5	27.0	14.3	6.9	9.0	18.0	7.4	4.534
8. Articles critical of the school board never should appear in the student newspaper.	Prn.	7.0	13.3	10.5	7.7	14.7	35.7	11.2	3.384***
	Adv.	4.8	5.3	6.4	8.5	13.3	36.7	25.0	2.696
9. Articles critical of local politicians never should appear in the student newspaper.	Prn.	7.7	13.3	11.9	14.0	11.9	30.8	10.5	3.566***
	Adv.	4.8	9.5	4.8	7.4	15.9	34.9	22.8	2.841
10. Articles critical of teachers or administrators never should appear in the student newspaper.	Prn.	12.0	17.6	14.1	6.3	15.5	24.6	9.9	3.908***
	Adv.	9.1	13.4	8.1	8.1	18.3	25.8	17.2	3.408
Role of the Student Newspaper									
11. Student rights to publish a newspaper must be balanced against the realization that students are not fully trained journalists.	Prn.	25.9	45.5	13.3	4.9	4.2	3.5	2.8	5.662*
	Adv.	21.5	37.7	17.8	6.3	6.3	8.9	1.6	5.288
12. Once students have been trained in press responsibility, they should have full control over all editorial content of the student newspaper.	Prn.	0.7	6.3	13.3	6.3	13.3	35.0	25.2	2.692***
	Adv.	4.7	12.1	19.5	10.0	19.5	18.9	15.3	3.547
13. High school students are too young to practice responsibly freedom of the press.	Prn.	6.3	10.6	14.8	3.5	13.4	33.8	17.6	3.211***
	Adv.	0.5	4.7	4.7	3.7	13.2	35.8	37.4	2.189
14. The student newspaper is more a learning tool than a vehicle for the expression of student opinion.	Prn.	22.2	36.8	18.1	8.3	7.6	5.7	1.4	5.354***
	Adv.	12.6	27.4	20.5	12.1	13.2	11.6	2.6	4.689
15. The student newspaper is a valuable public relations tool for the school.	Prn.	37.6	46.8	8.5	6.4	0.0	0.7	0.0	6.134
	Adv.	44.0	38.7	8.9	4.7	1.0	2.1	0.5	6.115
16. Guarantees of freedom of expression in the student newspaper outweigh public relations considerations.	Prn.	4.3	14.3	15.7	8.6	20.7	25.7	10.7	3.528***
	Adv.	13.1	23.6	18.8	14.1	14.1	12.6	3.7	4.549
Censorship									
17. If an administrator asks the adviser to read copy prior to publication, the adviser should do so.	Prn.	62.2	33.6	2.8	0.0	0.7	0.7	0.0	6.545***
	Adv.	42.0	34.0	8.5	5.9	2.7	4.3	2.7	5.835
18. The student newspaper adviser should review all copy before it is printed.	Prn.	69.2	27.3	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	6.629*
	Adv.	61.6	27.4	6.8	2.1	0.5	0.5	1.1	6.415
19. Having school administrators read student newspaper copy before publication is a form of censorship.	Prn.	13.3	42.7	11.9	6.3	2.1	16.1	7.7	4.797***
	Adv.	40.5	30.0	16.3	2.6	3.2	3.7	3.7	5.763
Responsibilities of Advisers									
20. The adviser should correct misspellings that students make in their copy.	Prn.	46.5	33.1	9.2	2.1	1.4	6.3	1.4	5.964
	Adv.	39.7	29.1	13.8	2.1	5.8	6.3	3.2	5.629
21. The adviser should correct factual inaccuracies in student copy before publication even if it is not possible to confer with the students involved.	Prn.	28.1	37.4	12.2	6.5	4.3	8.6	2.9	5.410
	Adv.	35.6	35.1	12.2	4.3	5.9	5.3	1.6	5.680
22. If the adviser knows that the newspaper is going to publish something that will put the school in a bad light, the adviser has a professional obligation to see that that particular item is not published.	Prn.	14.3	22.1	15.0	13.6	14.3	16.4	4.3	4.421***
	Adv.	6.9	11.2	16.5	10.6	12.8	28.2	13.8	3.489
23. Newspaper advisers who do not read copy of student newspapers before publication should be held personally responsible for any complaints about the newspaper.	Prn.	29.6	38.0	14.8	4.9	4.2	4.9	3.5	5.549*
	Adv.	28.4	28.4	13.7	5.8	6.3	9.5	7.9	5.068
24. The student newspaper adviser is ultimately responsible for the content of the student newspaper rather than the student editors.	Prn.	28.4	40.4	14.9	6.4	2.1	5.7	2.1	5.609**
	Adv.	26.2	30.4	14.1	3.1	7.9	10.5	7.9	5.010
25. The adviser who reviews copy for the student newspaper prior to publication becomes liable for the content.	Prn.	11.1	25.2	16.3	14.1	5.9	20.0	7.4	4.318
	Adv.	14.8	24.3	15.9	9.0	10.6	16.4	9.0	4.386

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE I CONTINUED

Statement	Pos.	St.A.	Agr.	Sl.A.	Neu.	Sl.D.	Dis.	St.D.	Mean
Role of Administrators									
26. Only persons with degrees in journalism should be advisers to student newspapers.	Prn.	7.6	11.8	13.2	13.2	13.2	25.0	16.0	3.486
	Adv.	8.9	7.9	12.6	15.7	9.9	28.3	16.8	3.382
27. Administrators believe it is more important to have newspaper advisers who will not rock the boat than ones with journalistic and advising skills.	Prn.	3.6	9.3	11.4	14.3	13.6	31.4	16.4	3.150***
	Adv.	10.5	20.4	16.8	18.3	10.5	18.3	5.2	4.261
28. School administrators at my school have little understanding of the First Amendment rights of the student newspaper.	Prn.	0.0	2.1	7.7	6.3	7.0	40.1	36.3	2.147***
	Adv.	3.1	8.9	9.9	10.5	7.3	39.8	20.4	2.890
29. Administrators seldom worry about the student newspaper unless it gets into controversial areas.	Prn.	5.6	25.9	17.5	3.5	9.1	30.8	7.7	3.923***
	Adv.	19.0	41.8	13.8	3.2	7.9	11.6	2.6	5.153
30. It is more important to the school board for the school to have a good image than to have an uncensored student newspaper.	Prn.	17.3	31.7	10.1	12.9	7.9	15.8	4.3	4.726
	Adv.	16.6	28.3	11.8	12.3	9.1	14.4	7.5	4.577
31. As long as the school board or school pays part of the costs, school administrators have control over what is printed in the school newspaper.	Prn.	16.1	25.9	19.6	7.7	7.0	17.5	6.3	4.587***
	Adv.	4.8	11.2	14.9	11.7	12.2	24.5	20.6	3.281
Controversial Issues									
32. Controversial issues have no place in a student newspaper.	Prn.	4.9	4.9	8.4	3.5	14.7	42.0	21.7	2.692***
	Adv.	2.1	1.0	3.7	1.6	13.1	29.8	48.7	1.931
33. The student newspaper should concern itself only with issues that relate to the school, not those of the larger community, state or nation.	Prn.	7.7	11.3	8.5	4.2	12.0	37.3	19.0	3.105**
	Adv.	2.6	6.3	8.4	3.7	13.6	29.3	36.1	2.481
34. The adviser is obligated to inform the administration of any controversial stories before the newspaper goes to press.	Prn.	36.2	39.0	13.5	5.7	4.3	0.0	1.4	5.914***
	Adv.	16.3	24.7	19.5	7.9	7.9	13.2	10.5	4.521
35. If the student newspaper takes one side of a controversial issue, it should be required to publish the other side.	Prn.	33.1	37.3	12.7	6.3	3.5	4.2	2.8	5.662*
	Adv.	33.2	29.5	10.5	6.3	6.3	8.4	5.8	5.284

St.A = Strongly Agree, Agr. = Agree, Sl.A. = Slightly Agree, Neu. = Neutral, Sl.D. = Slightly Disagree, Dis. = Disagree, St.D. = Strongly Disagree

Pos. = Position, Prn. = Principals, Adv. = Newspaper Advisers

***$p < .001$, **$p < .01$, *$p < .05$

TABLE II

Principals' and Advisers' Responses to Attitude Statements Related to the First Amendment in Percent

Statement	Pos.	St.A.	Agr.	Sl.A.	Neu.	Sl.D.	Dis.	St.D.	Mean
1. A free press is fundamental to American society.	Prn.	36.4	48.6	8.6	1.4	3.6	1.4	0.0	6.085***
	Adv.	66.0	29.3	3.1	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	6.581
2. Society has an obligation to protect the First Amendment rights of groups such as the American Nazi Party and the Ku Klux Klan.	Prn.	18.0	31.7	13.7	14.4	5.0	9.4	7.9	4.834*
	Adv.	28.9	30.0	11.1	11.1	6.3	5.3	7.4	5.189
3. The American Nazi Party has as much a constitutional right to a parade permit as the American Legion.	Prn.	16.1	32.8	12.4	13.1	6.6	7.3	11.7	4.700*
	Adv.	23.9	30.9	11.7	10.6	7.4	7.4	8.0	4.989
4. Most Americans support the concept of freedom of the press in theory but not in practice.	Prn.	7.1	41.4	20.0	12.9	5.0	12.1	1.4	4.907
	Adv.	16.3	39.5	19.5	10.0	5.8	7.4	1.6	5.221

St.A. = Strongly Agree, Agr. = Agree, Sl.A. = Slightly Agree, Neu. = Neutral, Sl.D. = Slightly Disagree, Dis. = Disagree, St.D. = Strongly Disagree

Pos. = Position, Prn. = Principals, Adv. = Newspaper Advisers

***$p < .001$, *$p < .05$

BEST COPY AVAILABLE